DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 112 SP 039 592

AUTHOR	Davidson, Lynn; Garton, Susan; Manges, Charles D.
TITLE	Teacher Leadership Academy: Achieving Systemic School Improvement.
PUB DATE	2000-10-00
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 25-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Active Learning; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Integrated Curriculum; *Leadership Training; Performance Based Assessment; Rural Schools; *School Restructuring; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Empowerment; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Active Teaching; Illinois; Teacher Leaders; *Teacher Leadership

ABSTRACT

This study investigated professional development as provided through the Teacher Leadership Academy (TLA) model used in rural Illinois area school districts and district consortia. Surveys were distributed to TLA participants that sought their perceptions of the desirability, involvement, and feasibility of school reform in general and the desirability, involvement, and feasibility of specific indicants of school change. The indicants included active learning, active teaching, integrated curriculum, application of technology, performance assessment, teacher empowerment, and teacher accountability. The study results support the premise that a strong desire for reform is present. Participants indicated that restructuring efforts are feasible. However, they expressed less confidence in being able to achieve integrated curriculum, teacher empowerment, and teacher accountability. All of the selected indicants of reform were desirable, with the exception of teacher accountability and performance assessment, for which desirability was significantly lower. (Contains 26 references.) (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 112

TEACHER LEADERSHIP ACADEMY:

ACHIEVING SYSTEMIC SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Dr. Lynn Davidson, Associate Professor, Dr. Susan Garton, Associate Professor,

Dr. Charles D. Manges, Ph. D.

Professor and Chair

C-Manges@wiu.edu

Department of Educational Administration and Supervision

Western Illinois University

A Paper Presented at the Mid-West Educational Research Association Conference

October, 2000

Chicago, IL

L. M. Davidson

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039592

Teacher Leadership Academy:

Administrators Achieving Systemic Campus Improvement

Abstract

School reform has consistently targeted student performance with some states recently adopting a focus on faculty development (Education Week, Jan. 2000). While student test scores may be impacted, systemic campus improvement integrated with continuing professional development seems to hold promise. Western Illinois area administrators and rural school districts have been involved in a program providing structured growth for faculty linked to systemic campus improvement. This study investigated professional development as provided through the Teacher Leadership Academy (TLA) model used in rural Illinois area school districts and district consortium. Surveys were distributed to TLA participants seeking perceptions of desirability, involvement, and feasibility of school reform in general, and the desirability, involvement, and feasibility of specific indicants of school change. Those indicants included Active Learning, Active Teaching, Integrated Curriculum, Application of Technology, Performance Assessment, Teacher Empowerment, and Teacher Accountability.

The study supports the premise that a strong desire for reform is present. Further, participants indicated that restructuring efforts are feasible. However, they expressed less confidence in being able to achieve Integrated Curriculum, Teacher Empowerment, and Teacher Accountability. All of the selected indicants of reform were desirable, with the exception of Teacher Accountability and Performance Assessment, for which desirability was significantly lower.

A recent review of education reform in the United States suggests that the continuing national focus on elementary and secondary school restructuring has now adopted a local flavor. Several states have selected continuing professional development as a component in their educational reform efforts (Education Week, January 2000). The components of continuing professional development may be broad in nature but the central theme is driven by the need for more effective educators.

The case for more effective educators, especially the need for mid-level leaders, was made by Sergiovanni, et.al. (1987) who found that "...committees are more diverse, expectations and demands for resources are more ambiguous and vocal, power and authority are more diffuse, and public participation in the affairs of the school is more intense." Even Sergiovanni could not predict the more intrusive state agencies, the plethora of legislative mandates, the court rulings and the shifts in school funding which have further complicated school operations.

Central to this issue, however, of developing a select group of teachers and having them become teacher leaders, is the concern of Terrel Bell (1984), who stressed that such teacher leaders should be encouraged to work with other teachers, help with curriculum development, accept student teachers, and do [accept] other actions to advance education, but [they] must also have limits put on these additional responsibilities so they can remain among the best teachers in their individual schools. Snowden and Gorton (1998) have highlighted the power to shape school culture by appointing such teacher leaders, who can communicate important values while serving as symbolic models. They suggest that formal appointments to leadership positions provide a multiplying effect by allowing such teacher leaders to work through additional informal opinion setters, who also help to shape and promote positive school values.

Developing Teachers as Leaders

Professional development plays a key role in preparing teachers to contribute toward standards-based school reform. Unfortunately, a body of research (Corcoran, 1995, Darling-Hammond, 1995; Hiebert, 1999; Lieberman, 1996; Little, 1993; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989) suggests that much of the professional development currently being provided does not meet the challenges of the reform movement. Wiles and Bondi (1996) conclude that preservice training Touches teachers only briefly and that inservice for teachers averages only three days a year, mostly on isolated topics and generally aimed at daily problems rather than substantial school change. The reinforcement of teacher isolation greatly reduces teacher learning and opportunities for shared knowledge, yet standards based reform emphasizes improved teaching as the best path to increased learning (Briman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000).

Optimistically, great promise for systemic school improvement through well-designed professional development is advocated, but roadmaps for the journey are lacking. Standards based reform is at the first and unquestionably the most crucial phase in an effective program - that of planning, especially with teachers participating as the planners (Kosmoski, 1997 p. 304).

Program Form and Structure

Years ago, Gordon Lawrence (1983) researched the necessary attributes for staff development that successfully produces school change. He concluded that the design must 1) change teacher attitudes, 2) have teachers serving as active planners and helpers, 3) produce individualized experiences, 4) provide active roles for teachers, 5) permit school based trials, with feedback, and 6) establish ownership and mutual assistance among teachers. Thus, effective staff development should facilitate (as compared to direct) adult learning and requires a user-friendly, risk-free, hands-on design which encourages and empowers educators to replicate

their learnings in their own settings within their own time frames and resources. Less effective are traditional staff development formats which are criticized for not giving teachers the time, activities, and the content necessary for increasing their knowledge and for fostering meaningful changes in classroom practice (Loucks-Horsley, Hewson, Love & Stiles, 1998). To enhance school effectiveness and improve student performance, Guthrie and Reed (1991) found that school staff development had to be a continuing developmental program, had to focus on a wide range of skills, abilities and needs, must be formal and systematic, must be undergirded with organizational commitment and adequate finances, and should incorporate life and professional experiences in a way that changes teacher paradigms.

Content focus:

The degree to which professional development focuses on content knowledge is directly related to teachers' perceived increases in knowledge and skills. Research (Cohen & Hill, 1998, Kennedy, 1998) suggests that teachers do not find generic professional development that focuses on teaching techniques effective without a matching emphasis on content knowledge. Obviously, such content can be curricular in definition, but applied to our central thought of producing systemic change, content also involves structural uniqueness, change theory, motivational techniques, leadership practice and rapid research capabilities.

Program Control

A central concern in seeking systemic change through professional development is the locus of control, because much of the governance structure (policies, decisions, budgets, requirements, etc.) can directly challenge and even degrade desired outcomes. Oliva (1993) identified five common sources of control for professional development: the principal, the superintendent or director of staff development, intermediate or cooperative education agencies,

teacher centers (where they exist), and colleges of education. He also noted a trend away from higher education and toward the school and principal as points of control. At a minimum, the goal of strengthening education, systemically, requires unprecedented cooperation among teachers, administration, public officials, teacher unions, institutions of higher education, and regulative agencies (Guthrie and Reed, 1991, p. 349). A design seeking systemic change must be based on collaboration among all of the foregoing control options and must include local districts and the teachers themselves among the collaborators.

Program Coherence

Coherence, much like control, indicates the extent to which professional development is part of an integrated program of teacher learning activities, so that it remains consistent with teacher goals, builds on earlier activities, and leads into subsequent activities that spiral toward systemic improvement. In the accountability-centered politics of today, coherent professional development activities should encourage continued professional communication among teachers and incorporate experiences that are consistent with teachers' goals, yet which are aligned with state standards and assessments. Program goals must not be limited to just producing better professionals, but also must address equipping those professionals to generate enhanced student achievement.

In short, as teachers are trained to become teacher leaders, issues in teaching must also be emphasized. Then, these teacher leaders can become robust advocates for the instructional change envisioned by Morrison, et. al. (2001), who stress that teacher leaders have true power, that which lies in the peer group, rather than in documents or presentations, to communicate positive consequences and thus assist in change. Only then can teacher leaders "... serve their school district by assisting administrators and teachers in decision-making, professional

development training, and support efforts that lead to higher achievement for all students " (CREC, 2000).

Active Learning:

Teachers whose professional development includes opportunities for active learning report increased knowledge and skills as well as changed classroom practice. Active learning encourages teachers to become engaged in meaningful discussion, planning, and practice as part of professional development (Liebermann, 1996; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998). Effective staff development must be designed with the opportunity for teachers to be actively involved and to construct their own meanings (Manges & Wigle, 1997; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995).

Basing systemic change in collegial and collaborative reflective practice offers a potent process for focusing and multiplying the power of the group to gain additional professional growth and to continue progress toward educational change. Garmston, Lipton, and Kaiser (1998) suggest that teachers develop new understandings of their work through collegial discussions during which "new aspects of experience are pointed out with fresh interpretation" (Rosenholtz cited in Firth & Pajak, 1998, p. 280). When teachers engage in the process of generating knowledge about their own thinking, "their teaching is transformed in important ways. They become theorists articulating their intentions, testing their assumptions" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1991, p. 55). Collegial conversation promotes reciprocal reflection and this enables practitioners to analyze, predict, and make explicit both current and new patterns of thinking and acting.

TLA Models

In 1997, The Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in the College of Education and Human Services at Western Illinois University accepted a key partnership role

in developing and delivering a unique form of school improvement to a collaborative group of rural school districts. Other partners in this effort included a six-county cooperative staff development agency, eight school districts, two Regional Superintendents (intermediate agencies), and a democratically selected leadership team from the teacher group itself.

This Teacher Leadership Academy (TLA) was conceptualized by the Regional Superintendents from Tazewell and Fulton-Schuyler Counties, who selected and modified the model of the Central Indiana Teacher Leadership Academy. This model, according to Cindy Whelan (cited in Braun, 2000), who directs the program for the Central Indiana Educational Service Center, emphasizes empowering teachers to become mid-level leaders within their own schools. It allows faculty who plan to remain in the classroom in their school, an opportunity for continuing professional development designed to enhance their leadership capacities.
The core collaborative team from the regional agencies recruited teachers from area schools, obtained funding commitments from their districts, and enlisted faculty from WIU's EDAD Department to assist in leading sessions, to offer graduate courses that integrate with district and school needs, and to ensure that participating teachers could earn a masters degree as a reward for their efforts.

The WIU TLA design, primarily the work of Jan Braun, adapted the central concept from the Central Indiana TLA: a long term, sequential program designed to combine the strengths of individual teachers into strong educational leadership cadres while maintaining classroom emphasis (Braun, 2000). During the first two years of the program, the emphasis was on positive self-enhancement, cutting edge research and best practices, with the potential to affect long term systemic change for school improvement. It reflected the commonalties of good teaching at all grade levels (Braun, 2000). After the initial two years, volunteers from the TLA

group continued through an additional two years of school-based leadership and educational studies, lead directly by WIU professors. The program design culminates with participants obtaining a master's degree in educational administration (but without administrator certification).

WIU now has been a partner in two of these TLA groups, and has also branched out to a second version of a TLA, based more closely on professional schools. This second version of TLA involves the K-12 teaching faculty employed at one specific rural Illinois school district. The charge to participants from that district is also to implement and sustain change. However, since a majority of the local public school colleagues are involved in the training and the areas of improvement are cooperatively pre-selected by the district, systemic change may be more rapid and more tightly focused. WIU now has two operating TLAs of this second version.

Both models deliver virtually the same content information, and with either model, the participants become eligible for a master's degree upon successful completion of the entire, multi-year program. Cultivated in a culture fostering inquiry, the collaborative practices of the TLA learning community should reverse three negative aspects that have defined school's approaches to teacher learning in the past: "Figure it out yourself"; Do it all yourself"; and "Keep it to ourselves" (Darling-Hammond, 1994, p. 8).

Problem statement

To determine whether school restructuring is achieved through the Teacher Leadership Academy will take several years of observation and documentation. However, as the department is barraged with both questions about the TLA program and requests from schools who want to become part of the TLA program, the immediate impact of the TLA provides an arena ripe for investigation.

Three primary criteria were established, which, if present in concert and in large quantity, would predict success in the ongoing and time consuming process of school change. These three criteria were:

1. The desirability of school reform in general, and also the desirability of specific indicants of school change (defined below). This reflects the degree of awareness and motivation within individuals in the TLA group as well as their knowledge of, and support for, school change.
2. The perceived degree of direct involvement in school reform, both in general and in specific indicants, currently in TLA schools. This reveals the professional capability to draw supported judgments, again confirms the knowledge of essential reform concepts, and also measures the awareness of local efforts.
3. The feasibility of school reform in general, and the feasibility of specific indicants of school change. This assessment by TLA teachers demonstrates their technical ability to analyze the potential of the local school situation and also tests their ability to quantify the capability for change in their colleagues.

Based on the foregoing reviews of research, the indicants of school reform were identified as Active Learning (on the part of students), Active Teaching (with its role change for teachers), Integrated Curriculum (both within and across disciplines), Application of Technology (emphasizing use as a learning tool), Performance Assessment (both design and procedures), Teacher Empowerment (authority to make substantive decisions) and Teacher Accountability (responsibility for effects of, and modifications to, decisions).

Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of TLA teachers regarding the potential for, and progress in, restructuring at their individual schools?

2. To what extent do TLA teachers believe restructuring activities are desirable?

3. To what extent do TLA teachers believe their individual schools are involved in restructuring activities?

4. To what extent do TLA teachers believe restructuring activities are feasible?

5. Are there variances in perceptions within and among the identified indicants of restructuring?

6. Are perceptions strongly influenced by external factors such as gender, race, advanced education, experience in district or version of TLA?

Sample design, and methodology

A survey identifying indicants of effective staff development, the degree of satisfaction with restructuring in the participant schools, and participant satisfaction related to professional growth was distributed in order to investigate school improvement efforts of the TLA participants. In addition, the survey permitted an examination of whether differences exist in perceptions about restructuring between TLA individuals and groups.

Using three primary criteria, the researchers sought to identify the extent of desirability, feasibility, and involvement for both reform in general and for the selected indicants of restructuring. The respondents, who, at this point, are limited to elementary and secondary teachers, were supplied with definitions of the indicants to facilitate their understanding and to standardize their responses.

The results of the study are presented as responses to the six research questions.

1. What are the perceptions of TLA teachers regarding the potential for, and progress in, restructuring at their schools?

A majority of TLA participants strongly desire that their schools restructure, since 71% desire reforms and an additional 24% find reforms highly desirable. Their perceptions are not as rosy, however, when it comes to current involvement, with 3% indicating that their school is not involved in reforms at all and only 21% reporting their school as highly involved in reforms. All the TLA members (100%) said reforms were at least somewhat feasible in their schools, with a large majority (86%) assessing reforms as either feasible or highly feasible.

While 45% of the respondents suggest that their school is now restructured to some degree, the remaining 55% indicated that only slight or no restructuring has occurred. Most believe their school is typical, since over half (53%) believe their school is comparable to others in terms of being restructured and three out of four (74%) feel their school is comparable or ahead of other schools in making progress toward restructuring.

In conclusion, the researchers found TLA teachers universally agreeing that their schools have the capability to restructure and almost all suggesting that reforms are desirable. They also believe that the potential to reform is not being fully realized, since adequate progress is not reflected in three fourths of their schools.

2. To what extent do TLA teachers believe restructuring activities are desirable?

Consistent with the findings on the first research question, wherein 95% of TLA teachers desired reforms in general, investigation revealed that they generally rated all of the reform indicants desirable, but to a lesser extent than reforms in general. With the notable exception of Teacher Accountability, the TLA teachers had universal agreement that all of the indicants were at least somewhat desirable. They were most supportive of Application of Technology, with

only 3% rating it somewhat desirable and Active Teaching, with only 9% rating it as somewhat desirable. Strong support was expressed for Teacher Empowerment (with only 9% somewhat desirable), Active Learning (with 10% somewhat desirable) and Integrated Curriculum (with 11% somewhat desirable). However, a significant difference was observed between these and the last two indicants, with Performance Assessment having 19% rate it as somewhat desirable and Teacher Accountability, for which 2% actually rated it not desirable, and an additional 10% rated it as somewhat desirable.

In conclusion, the TLA teachers overwhelming suggested that reforms were desirable in general, and they enthusiastically supported most indicants of restructuring. It is notable that Performance Assessment and Teacher Accountability had a lesser degree of desirability than the other five indicants.

3. To what extent do TLA teachers believe their individual schools are involved in restructuring activities?

When considering the indicants of restructuring separately, the TLA teachers were less positive about most items than in their overall assessment of involvement reported for research question one. Also of note is the pattern of their responses, which clearly identify winners and losers in school efforts to reform.

Not surprisingly, 100% of the TLA teachers were at least somewhat involved in the Application of Technology, with 21% saying their school was highly involved in this indicant. Similarly, 98% were somewhat involved with Active Teaching, although a marked drop to 2% of schools in the highly involved rating shows much less perceived success with this indicant. Active Learning and Integrated Curriculum were next in order of involvement, with 95% and 92%, respectively, indicating that the school was somewhat involved.

A different pattern begins to emerge when Performance Assessment, Teacher Empowerment and Teacher Accountability are considered. A total of 11% reported their schools were not involved in Performance Assessment with only 2% reporting high involvement. Teacher Empowerment shows even less involvement, with 15% of schools not involved and again only 2% highly involved. Teacher Accountability has the least involvement, with no schools being highly involved and 12% not involved at all.

In conclusion, when the indicants of reform are considered individually, TLA teachers reported less involvement than with reform efforts in general. Most of the schools were broadly involved in implementing most of the indicants, but significantly fewer schools were implementing Teacher Accountability and Teacher Involvement than the other five indicants. With the notable exception of Applications of Technology, where universal involvement was reported, at least a few schools (2% to 15%) are reported with no involvement in each of the individual indicants of reform.

4. To what extent do TLA teachers believe restructuring activities are feasible?

The general optimism for the feasibility of reform reported for research question one is only reflected in a single indicant, Application of Technology, where 88% of TLA teachers rated this indicant as either feasible or highly feasible. Two other indicants come close to this pattern of response, with Active Teaching producing 82% and Active Learning 81% as either feasible or highly feasible. The pattern is less evident for Performance Assessment, where 77% of the participants rated it feasible or highly feasible.

A second pattern, distinctly different from the results for general reform efforts, emerges in the three remaining indicants. For all three, a small number of TLA teachers (2-3%) rate them as not feasible and the majority at the upper end of the scale shrinks to 68-71% who rate them as

feasible or highly feasible.

In conclusion, all TLA teachers suggested that the indicants of Active Learning, Active Teaching, Application of Technology and Performance Assessment were somewhat feasible in their schools. There is less confidence in achieving the remaining three, with a few teachers feeling that Integrated Curriculum, Teacher Empowerment and Teacher Accountability are not feasible in their schools at all.

5. Are there variances in perceptions within and among the seven identified indicants of restructuring?

Given the generally positive responses on all three criteria (desirability, involvement, and feasibility) for reform in general, it would be very surprising to find much variance within and among the separate indicants of restructuring. Analysis of findings for research questions two through four confirms this. Initial consideration was afforded to perceptions across all three criteria (desirability, involvement, feasibility) within each indicant.

For Application of Technology, consistent high ratings on all three criteria were observed. For Active Learning and Active Teaching, high desirability and feasibility were universally observed, but dramatically lower involvement was also observed. For Performance Assessment, strong desirability and feasibility, but very low involvement were revealed. For Integrated Curriculum and Teacher Empowerment, the data indicated high desirability but relatively low involvement and feasibility. For Teacher Accountability, consistent ratings were witnessed across all three criteria, however, the ratings were lower than for other indicants.

To determine if optimism for reform in general would influence the ratings for individual indicants, a Pearson Correlation test was administered to determine if the individual rating for reforms in general influenced the responses for the individual indicants of reform. Table A

presents the correlation coefficients that were significant at the .01 level. Clearly there was no general pattern of influence, but since seven of eight correlations within feasibility were significantly positive, a strong belief in the feasibility of reforms in general at a school align with similar beliefs about the feasibility of individual indicants.

Table A: Pearson Correlation Coefficients			
(Only those significant at the .01 level are shown. * marks those at .05 level)	Between desirability of reforms in general and	Between involvement in reforms in general and	Between feasibility of reforms in general and
	Desirability	Involvement	Feasibility
Active Learning	0.406	0.585	0.429
Active Teaching	*	0.473	
Integrated Curriculum		0.482	
Application of Tech		0.375	
Performance Assessment			
Teacher Empowerment	*	0.337	0.37
Teacher Accountability		0.344	0.382

The issue of one rating influencing another held promise and it was investigated by also performing the Pearson test to correlate all ratings among all indicants. Of these 63 correlations across all criteria, only 17 were significant at the .01 level and none was greater than .585. Therefore, the participants were independently rating all indicants without being unduly influenced by their responses on other survey items or on other indicants.

The perceptions on each criterion among all the seven indicants was next reviewed. . Regarding the desirability criterion, two indicants, Performance Assessment and Teacher

Accountability, expressed significantly less support. Related to the involvement criterion, three indicants, Performance Assessment, Teacher Accountability and Teacher Empowerment, revealed significantly less implementation. Regarding the feasibility criterion, three indicants, Integrated Curriculum, Teacher Empowerment and Teacher Accountability were observed with ratings notably lower than the other indicants.

Across all three criteria, Active Learning, Active Teaching and Application of Technology are rated similarly and strongly positive. The results for Integrated Curriculum are similar but its feasibility was somewhat lower. For Performance Assessment and Teacher Empowerment, both involvement and feasibility are noticeably lower. Teacher Accountability has significantly less desirability, involvement and feasibility than the other six indicants.

6. Are perceptions strongly influenced by external factors such as gender, race, advanced education, experience in district or version of TLA?

In the first two TLA groups currently under study, there were not enough males, nor enough non-whites, to provide reliable comparisons. Among the TLA teachers, however, 10 of 62, or 16% already have a masters degree. Comparing this group with the remainder, who have bachelors degrees, produces an interesting difference between the groups.

Although no differences were significant at the .01 level, those participants with masters degrees strongly tended toward higher ratings on all three criteria. Their average ratings were all higher when considering school restructuring and in all areas of reforms in general, with the notable exception of feasibility, where they were lower. Across the 21 responses for the seven indicants, participants with masters degrees had higher average ratings on 20 of them, with again a notable exception in that desirability of Performance Assessment was lower.

Years of experience in the current school district was selected to establish a Pearson

Correlation with individual ratings on each of the items. Only one correlation was significant at the .01 level, and that, surprisingly, was a -.353 correlation between years in district and whether teachers saw their school as a leader in reform. Negative but not significant correlations dominated the calculations, with all responses to reforms in general having negative correlations and 15 of 21 ratings on individual indicants also being negative. Of those, they were equally divided among the three criteria. A trend toward seniority in the school influencing perceptions in a negative manner was surprising but evident.

Another matter of concern was whether the two versions of TLA (the original multi-district format and the later, single district grouping) would produce different perceptions of school reform, especially since the former has nearly completed the four year program and the latter is only in its second year. The groups themselves were remarkably similar in terms of gender and race, and virtually identical in terms of teaching experience (means of 15.8 and 15.97 years, respectively) and seniority in district (means of 11.59 and 11.85 years, respectively).

When the responses of the two groups were compared, a t test revealed only four items on which they differed, one at the .01 level of significance and three at the .05 level. The single district TLA rated their district significantly less of a leader in educational reforms but significantly higher in involvement with Active Teaching, feasibility of Active Teaching and feasibility of Application of Technology (the latter being the one significant at the .01 level).

Summary of Findings

All of the findings are preliminary, since no measurements on control groups nor on pre- and post- assessments were compared. However, the investigation suggests that the TLA teachers share a strong desire for school reform and all agree that restructuring is feasible in their schools, but report mixed levels of progress at implementing reforms and only about half believe

that their school is now restructured, at least in part. In addition to their general enthusiasm for reform, TLA teachers also found all of the selected indicants of reform desirable, with the exception of Teacher Accountability and Performance Assessment, for which desirability was significantly lower.

TLA teachers reported 100% involvement in their schools in Application of Technology but reported decreasing levels of involvement, respectively, in Active Teaching, Active Learning, Integrated Curriculum, Performance Assessment and Teacher Empowerment. The lowest level of involvement was Teacher Accountability, with no schools highly involved and 12% not involved at all.

All TLA teachers see Active Learning, Active Teaching, Application of Technology and Performance Assessment as feasible in their schools, but have much less confidence in being able to achieve Integrated Curriculum, Teacher Empowerment and Teacher Accountability. However, few differences were present among TLA teachers or TLA groups based on external factors.

References

Ball, D.L. (1996). Teacher learning and the mathematics reforms: What we think we know and what we need to learn. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(7), 500-508.

Bell, T. (1984). The peer review model for elementary and secondary schools. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education.

Briman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet (2000). Designing Professional Development that Works. Educational Leadership (Fall 2000).

Braun, J. (2000). Jan Braun's introduction to teacher leadership. [On-line] Available: http:// www.tazewell.k12.il.us/dist102/intro.html.

Cohen, D.K., & Hill, H.C. (1998). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California (RR-39). Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. "Learning to Teach against the grain." Harvard Educational Review, 61(3), (1991): 279-310.

Corcoran, T.B. (1995). Transforming professional development for teachers: A guide for state policymakers. Washington DC: National Governors Association.

CREC ñ Capital Region Educational Council. (2000). Teacher leadership center. [On-line] Available: http://www.crec.org/tlc/

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Changing conceptions of teaching and teacher development. Teacher Education Quarterly, 22(4), 9-26.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Professional development schools: schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Firth, G.R., & Pajak, E.F. (1998). Handbook of research on school supervision. New York: Macmillan.

Garmston, R., Lipton, L.E., & Kaiser, K. The Psychology of supervision. In Gerald Firth and Edward Pajack (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision, pp. 242-286. New York: Macmillan, 1998.

Guthrie, J. & Reed, R. (1991). Educational administration and policy: effective leadership for American education. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hiebert, J. (1999). Relationships between research and the NCTM standards. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 30(1), 3-19.

Kosmoski, G. (1997). Supervision. Mequon, IL: Stylex Publishing Co., 304.

Lawrence, G. (1983). Problems of effective inservice education. (monograph) Tallahassee: Florida Dept. of Education.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1996). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. In M.W. McLaughlin & I. Oberman (Eds.), Teacher learning: New politics, new policies (pp185-201). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J.W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15(2), 129-151.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Hewson, P.W., Love, N. & Stiles, K.E. (1998). Designing professional development for teaches of science and mathematics. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Manges, C. D. & Wigle, S. E. (1997) Quality schools and constructivist teaching. The Journal of Reality Therapy, Spring, 1997.

Morrison, G., Ross, S., & Kemp, J. (2001). Designing effective instruction, 3rd Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Newmann, F.M., & Associates. (1996). Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oliva, P. (1993). Supervision for today's schools, 4th Edition. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Sergiovanni, T., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. & Thurstan, P. (1987). Educational governance and administration, 2nd Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Snowden, P. & Gorton, R. (1998). School leadership and administration, 4th Edition. Dubuque , IA: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 10(4), 40-57.

Wiles, J. & Bondi, J. (1996). Supervision: A guide to practice, Fourth Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, (1995). Diversity and motivation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

More and more, we are being faced with calls for restructuring of our educational system. These efforts at restructuring have focused on curriculum, teachers, students, administrators, and other factors impacting schools. The following survey is designed to determine the success of the restructuring efforts provided through the Teacher Leadership Academy. This survey is being sent to classroom teachers, principals, superintendents, and consortium board members involved with the Teacher Leadership Academy training provided by Western Illinois University. The results of the survey will be compiled and comparisons will be made related to participant responses. We would appreciate your willingness to complete this survey **and return it in the enclosed envelope by September 30, 2000**. Your individual responses will remain confidential and only the summary results will be distributed. Please **do not** place your name on the survey. Your responses will be pooled with others to determine overall perceptions. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in completing this survey.

Please complete **all** sections providing the response which most appropriately answers the following questions.

Gender = Male Female	**Ethnicity** _____
My **primary role** in this district is: Board Member Superintendent Principal Elementary Teacher Secondary Teacher	I have **served in this role** in this district for _____ years
My total years of service in education are _____	My **highest degree** obtained is _____

Please **circle** the response which most appropriately matches your opinion related to each of the following questions.

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING
In my opinion, based on the level and kinds of educational innovations that are being implemented at my school, I would rate my school as:

Not Restructured	Slightly Restructured	Restructured	Highly Restructured

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL INNOVATION
As schools seek to network with one another regarding restructuring, some schools are perceived by other educators as more innovative than others. I believe that my school is seen by other schools and districts as:

Not Innovative	Somewhat Innovative	Innovative	Highly Innovative

PERCEPTIONS OF COMPARATIVE SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING
In comparison to other schools with which I am familiar, I believe that my school is:

Far behind other schools in terms of being restructured	Slightly behind other schools in terms of being restructured	Comparable to other schools in terms of being restructured	Far ahead of other schools in terms of being restructured

REFORM:
Traditional staff development formats are criticized for not giving teachers the time, activities, and the content necessary for increasing their knowledge and for fostering meaningful change in the classroom practice. Staff development should be structured as a "reform" activity or as a traditional workshop or conference (Loucks-Horsley, Hewson, Love & Stiles, 1998).

How **desirable** is it that the suggested reforms be implemented in your school?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Desirable	Desirable	Desirable	Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with the suggested reforms?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Involved	Involved	Involved	Involved

How **feasible** is it that the suggested reforms will be implemented in your school?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Feasible	Feasible	Feasible	Feasible

ACTIVE LEARNING
Teachers whose professional development includes opportunities for student-centered active learning report increased knowledge and skills and changed classroom practice. Active learning encourages teachers to become engaged in meaningful discussion, planning, and practice as part of the professional development activity (Liebermnan, 1996; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998).

How **desirable** is it that the active learning strategies will change classroom practice in your school?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Desirable	Desirable	Desirable	Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with a change in classroom practice through active learning?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Involved	Involved	Involved	Involved

How **feasible** is it that the active learning strategies will change classroom practice in your school?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Feasible	Feasible	Feasible	Feasible

ACTIVE TEACHING
The change in the role of students to active learners results in a role change for teachers as well. Rather than being seen as a disseminator of information, the teacher is seen as a facilitator who directs students in the learning process. The teacher coaches students and demonstrates what is to be learned. Teachers spend more time planning for small groups and individual students.

How **desirable** is it for active teaching strategies to be implemented in your school?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Desirable	Desirable	Desirable	Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with active teaching strategies?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Involved	Involved	Involved	Involved

How **feasible** is it for active teaching strategies to be implemented in your school?

Not	Somewhat		Highly
Feasible	Feasible	Feasible	Feasible

INTEGRATED CURRICULUM

Another change taking place in the curriculum of restructured schools occurs with subject matter. Instead of focusing on teaching each subject as an independent discipline, schools work toward integrating a number of content disciplines. Learning becomes centered around ideas, themes, and problems rather than being fragmented into separate subject areas.

How **desirable** is it that the changes suggested by integrated curriculum be implemented in your school?

Not Desirable	Somewhat Desirable	Desirable	Highly Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with integrated curriculum?

Not Involved	Somewhat Involved	Involved	Highly Involved

How **feasible** is it that the changes suggested by integrated curriculum will be implemented in your school?

Not Feasible	Somewhat Feasible	Feasible	Highly Feasible

APPLICATION OF TECHNOLOGY

Schools involved in restructuring use technology as a learning tool. Students are taught how to use technology to search data bases, conduct research, examine relationships between events, and monitor their own learning.

How **desirable** is it for the application of technology to be implemented in your school?

Not Desirable	Somewhat Desirable	Desirable	Highly Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with the application of technology?

Not Involved	Somewhat Involved	Involved	Highly Involved

How **feasible** is it for the application of technology to be implemented in your school?

Not Feasible	Somewhat Feasible	Feasible	Highly Feasible

PERFORMANCE-BASED ASSESSMENT

In a restructured school, student progress is determined by performance-based assessments. Rather than being measured exclusively by standardized testing, student mastery is demonstrated by performance supported by authentic assessment procedures. Students display their understanding through projects, exhibitions, demonstrations, portfolios, or other real-life methods.

How **desirable** is it for performance-based assessment to be implemented in your school?

Not Desirable	Somewhat Desirable	Desirable	Highly Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with performance-based assessment?

Not Involved	Somewhat Involved	Involved	Highly Involved

How **feasible** is it for performance-based assessment to be implemented in your school?

Not Feasible	Somewhat Feasible	Feasible	Highly Feasible

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT

Schools involved in the restructuring process place a strong emphasis on teacher empowerment. Teachers, looked at as competent professionals, are given the authority to make decisions affecting their school.

How **desirable** is it for teacher empowerment to be implemented in your school?

Not Desirable	Somewhat Desirable	Desirable	Highly Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with teacher empowerment?

Not Involved	Somewhat Involved	Involved	Highly Involved

How **feasible** is it for teacher empowerment to be implemented in your school?

Not Feasible	Somewhat Feasible	Feasible	Highly Feasible

TEACHER ACCOUNTABILITY

With the added opportunity for decision making, teachers in restructured schools gain a strong commitment to the school. Accompanying this is the added responsibility of increased teacher accountability for decisions made and the outcomes of those decisions.

How **desirable** is it for teacher accountability to be implemented in your school?

Not Desirable	Somewhat Desirable	Desirable	Highly Desirable

To what extent is your school already **involved** with teacher accountability?

Not Involved	Somewhat Involved	Involved	Highly Involved

How **feasible** is it for teacher accountability to be implemented in your school?

Not Feasible	Somewhat Feasible	Feasible	Highly Feasible